fighting, the Americans were not armed heavily

Spanyo's Elstery of the Navy

FIRST NOTICE. In four volumes, collectively comprising over eighteen hundred pages, Mr. John R. SPEARS has undertaken to set forth The History of Our Navy from Its Origin to the Present Day. It is od of one hundred and twenty-two years which is covered by this narrative, but this is naturally divided into four sections, corresponding to as many volumes. The first carries es from the attempt to organize a national navy in 1775 up to the assault of the Leopard upon Chesapeake in 1807. In the second third volumes the author describes exploits of the navy in the war of 1812, its subsequent operations against the West Indian pirates and the Barbary States the part which it took in the war with Mexico and the expedition under Commodore M. C. Perry which brought about the first American treaty with Japan. The fourth and concluding volume of the work is devoted to the history of one navy during the civil war and of the subst quent reconstruction of our naval force. It is only the first of these volumes which we can examine at this time, and this we must needs do very briefly, allotting the most of the space at our command to the naval achievements pe formed during the Revolution, most of which, for various reasons, are less familiar than even those which took place in the first war against the Barbary States.

Mr. Spears points out in his first chapter that the first steps taken toward the organization of a national navy were due to the necessity of ob taining supplies of munitions of war, and especially of gunpowder, of which there was a great lack in the colonies. The quick method obtaining such supplies was to ca; ture them from the enemy. The earliest reference to this dient for getting gunpowder in the reports of the doings of the Continental Congress is to be found in the minutes for Thursday, Oct. 5, 1775. It was then resolved to inform Gen Washington that two brigs loaded with powder and other stores for Quebec had been sent from England without convoy. he was requested to apply to the authorities of Massachusetts Bay for the two armed vessels in their service, and to send them "at the expense of the Continent" after the British. On Oct. 13 it was provided that "a swift vessel to carry ten carriage guns and a proportional number of swivels, with eighty men be fitted out with all possible despatch for a cruise of three months." Seventeen days later It was resolved that a second vessel should be fitted out to carry fourteen guns and a propor tionate number of swivels and men, while two other ships, one to carry not more than twenty guns and the other not more than thirty-six, were to be chartered for th purpose, namely, to cruise eastward and intercept the British storeships, speaking, these resolutions did not provide for an American navy; they simply furnished temporary means for obtaining sup plies. It was not until Nov. 25, 1775, that the Congress determined to create a navy, and to Issue commissions not only for the Captains of Polonial cruisers, but for the commanders of privateers as well. Even now these commisned officers were not authorized to prey upor British commerce at discretion, but were per mitted simply to attack armed British vessels and transports in the same service. Three days later the minutes contain the first adopted "Rules for the regulation of the Navy of the United Colonies." On Dec. 11 the Congress ordered a committee to be appointed to devise ways and means for furnish ing the Colonies with a naval armament. In two days the committee reported in favor of building five ships of thirty-two guns, five of twenty-eight guns, three of twenty-four guns, making in the whole thirteen. Meanwhile the Marine Committee of Congress, appointed to fit out vessels to cruise eastward after the King's transports, had purchased two merchant ships which they renamed Alfred and Columbus and supplied with twenty nine-nounders each; three brigs carrying from twelve to fourteen four-pounders, a sloop of ten guns, and two eight-gun schooners. On Dec. 22, 1775 Congress confirmed the appointment of the officers, and on the same day, apparently, Commodore Esek Hopkins, the naval Commander-in-Chief hoisted his ponnon on board the Alfred, and spread to the breeze the first American naval ensign, which was a flag of thirteen stripes alternately red and white, with the British jack

in the field The naval career of Commodore Esek Hopkins lasted for a year and ten days. It by no mean brought him glory at the time, but Mr. Spears thinks that if circumstances are considered it was not discreditable. He had but eight vessels, of which only two were ships, the others being rigs or smaller craft; moreover, all were b merchantmen. All told, this squadror mounted just 114 guns, of which the largest were cannons that could throw a round cast-iron ball weighing nine pounds. Even of these there were less than fifty. Such was the force which put to sea to make war against a navy of 112 ships, carrying 3,714 guns, whereon no fewer than seventy-eight ships, carrying 2,078 guns, were either already on the Ameri can coast or under orders to go there. A comparison, however, of the number of guns, 11against 2,078, conveys but a faint idea of the glaring inferiority of the American sea power for while the best of the American guns were but 9-pounders, at least a fourth of the gups o the British ships, or say 500, were 18-pounders or heavier. In the matter of experience and training the American crews were but little better than their ships and guns. The Yankee ver sels were manned, for the greater part, by seasick landsmen, and short-handed at that What Hopkins did, nevertheless, was to capture New Providence, in the Rahama in March, 1776, where 100 cannon and large quantity of stores fell into his hands which he succeeded in bringing into New Lon don after a fight off the east end of Long Island in which a single British aloop of war, the Gla gow, successfully contended against the whole American fleet. The popular indignation at the escape of the Glasgow practically put an end to the career of Commodore Hopkins, although he was not dismissed from the service until Jan. 2, 1777. The title of Commander-in-Chief, in tended to rank him with Washington, the Commander-in-Chief of the army, was never again conferred on an American naval man. We cannot here recapitulate the exploits per

formed by Capt. Nicholas Biddle, Capt. Elisha Hinman, Capt. Abraham Whipple, Capt. Charles Alexander and others during the year 1776. It must suffice to say that during the year nam the Yankees captured 342 vessels, of which forty-two were recaptured, eighteen released and five burned. How valuable these prizes were to the struggling colonists will be approciated when we recall that at this time the Amer ican levies were wholly dependent on foreig sources for both powder and guns. There was no factory for making even muskets, and individual gensmiths could do but little toward providing an army. There was, however, no sort of military supplies that was not forthcoming, owing to the captures made by the Yankee vessels

We would pass over, however, without particular mention the battle on Lake Champlain between Sir Guy Carleton's fleet and that commanded by Benedict Arnold, which took place on Oct. 11, 1776. Carleton's purpose was, after clearing Lake Champlain of American vessels, to capture the fortresses at Crown Point and Ticonderoga, and then push southward to Albany, which then was much more feebly defended than it was to be a year later. The disproportion of naval strength in this engagement was considerable. It is true that the American vessels mounted eighty-eight guns to the eighty-nine of the British fleet, but the cannon were inferior in weight of metal, the largest being eighteenpounders, as against the British twenty-four unders. Moreover, the Americans had but 700 men, most of them farmers. On the other hand, Carleton's fleet was munned by a thousand men, including 670 picked seamen from the warships in the St. Lawrence, besides the soldiers detailed for the expedition.

In the engagement, which lasted nearly all day, two of the British gunboats were sunk and

one was blown up, and Carleton ter withdrew his vessels to get beyond the range of the guns of the American fleet. Arnold had been much more severely crippled, however, and slipped away in the night, hoping to find shelter either at Crown Point or at Ticen deroga. Two days later, while yet some leagues distant from Crown Point, the Americans were overtaken, and one of the most desperate conflicts in naval annals occurred. After one-third of Arnold's crew had been killed, and his boats reduced to a wreck, he still refused to give up his vessels, but fired them all after putting his crews on shore. The extraordinary tenacity of the resistance offered by Arnold discouraged Carleton from pursuing his plan of attacking Ticonderoga, which was accordingly postponed until the following year, when the ill-fated Burgoyne assumed command of the British forces. Arnold's defeat, more glorious than many a victory, saved the colonies from an invasion which, if made in 1776, would doubt ess have cut the confederacy in twain and put an end to the hope of American independence. 11.

The relatively familiar exploits of John

Paul Jones and other national command-

ers in British waters are related in chapters

VI., and IX. Another chapter, the

eighth, is allotted to the deeds of American privateers. We cannot follow the nar rative in detail, but will simply draw atter tion to results. Mr. Spears quotes from Dods ley's "Annual Register" for 1778 a statement made in Parliament regarding the work accomplished by American national oruisers and privateers up to the end of 1777. From this statement it appears that the number of vessels belonging to Great Britain and Ireland which were taken by ships of war and privateers belonging to the colonies was at the date name 733, of which forty-seven were released by the French authorities and 137 were retaken. The loss, even on the latter, for salvage, interest on the value of the cargo, and deprivation of market, must have been considerable. The loss on the remaining 559 vessels which were car ried into port by American cruisers or privateers seems, according to the testimony of the merchants, to have amounted to at least \$13,-000 000. It appears, further, from the state ment made in Parliament, that of 200 ships annually employed in the African trade before the beginning of the war, ships whose average value was about \$45,000 each, there were not forty remaining in the trade at the end of 1777; consequently in this branch of commerce alone there was a diminution of 160 ships which at \$45,000 each, amounted to a loss of \$7,200,000 per annum. Another significant fact brought out was that the price of insurance to the West Indies and North America had been increased from 2 and 21e to 5 per cent, with convoy; while merchant vessels without convoy and unarmed, had to pay 15 per cent. Indeed, generally, in such circumstances, ships could no be insured at all. Meanwhile a seaman's wages had been raised from one pound ten shillings to three pounds five shillings per month. Ac cording to the same statement, which was based, we learn, on investigations conducted by a com mittee of the House of Commons, the number of American privateers, concerning which ther was authentic evidence, was not less than 173 these vessels, carried 2,056 guns and at least 13,840 seamen; 80 men being eckoned to each ship. Worth reproduction also, as testifying to the work accomplished by American seamen in the Revolutionary war is a statement which o curs in the fifth volume of the London "Remembrance," to the effect that the number of English vessels employed in the West India trade alone which had been cap tured by American cruisers amounted as early as Feb. 1, 1777, to 250; the value of the pargoes was put at about \$10,000,000. In the course of one week fourteen English vessel were carried into Martinique. So overstocked was the market of this island by their cargoes that English silk stockings which had usually sold for \$2 or \$3, were disposed of for \$1. Sailors went from door to door offering their prize goods for sale; nor could they dispose of Irish linen for more than \$2 per plece. Other goods were sold at proportionate prices. We note, finally, that of a fleet of sixty vessels bound from Ireland to the West Indies, no fewer than thirtyfive were captured by American privateers "God knows," wrote a British subject in the island of Grenada, "that if this war continue much longer we shall all die of hunger.'

The work done by John Paul Jones in the Honhomme Richard is too well known to need even a cursory allusion, but certain incidents which took place in 1779 should be mentioned, for the reason that they have been generall forgotten. On March 18, in the year named. squadron sailed from Boston, consisting of th frigate Warren, thirty-two guns, Capt. J. B. Warren; the Queen of France, twenty-eigh guns, Capt. Joseph Olney, and the Ranger, of eighteen guns, under Capt. Simpson. A few avs later a privateer was capture was learned from her crew that a fleet of armed transports and storeships had sailed from New York with supplies for the British Army in the South. Two days later the Yankee squadron overtook the British vessels and attacked them Of the nine transports seven were taken, including three which carried between them forty four guns. In May of the same twelve-month the frigate Queen of France, under Capt. Rathbourne; the Ranger, under Capt. Simpson, and the Providence, twenty-eight guns, under Capt. Abraham Whipple, went on a cruise. For two months these vessels did nothing, but early in July they fell in with a great fleet of British merchantmen, escorted by a seventy-four and number of frigates. Notwithstanding the strength of the convoy, the Yankees cut out cleven of the merchant ships and carried them into port. It is recorded that the cargoes o these ships were worth over a million dollars in gold, and that this cruise was, financially, the most profitable of them all.

III. Then came a severe reverse for the young American navy. A fleet of transports and pri ateers, carrying 1,500 militis, was sent to cap ture a fort established by the British on the Penobscot, as a base for operating against Mas-sachusetts. With this fleet went the frigate Warren, Capt. Saltonstall; the brig Diligent, and the old brig Providence, that had seen service from the first. The expedition reached the Penobscot July 25, 1779, and found not only a fort but three warships carrying, in the aggregate, forty-nine guns. An attack was made but the Americans were repulsed. They the began the process of reducing the works by seige, but on Aug. 15 appeared a British leet, comprising one sixty-four, three frigates of thirty-two guns each, three sloops of war, carrying, in the aggregate, forty eight guns, and a brig of fourteen guns. At the sight of this hostile fleet the privateers scat ered, and the American national vessels, with the transports, retreated up the river, where al were destroyed, to prevent the enemy getting them. This grievous blow to the fast dwindling American naval forces was followed by the los of the twenty-four-gun ship Boston, the two frigates, Providence and Queen of France, each carrying twenty-eight guns, and the Ranger, all of which fell into the hands of the British when Charleston was captured. Thereafter, of all the ships that the Congress had built or purchased and placed in service, only six remained in the American Navy. These were the Alliance, of thirty-two guns; the Confederacy and the Deane, of equal metal; the Trumbull, of twenty-eight guns; the Duc de Lauzun, of twenty guns, and the Saratoga, of eighteen What was worse, by the end of 1779 both off cers and men were scarce, because the British, knowing the supply of American seamen to be limited, had refused to exchange sailor prisoners. Even of the seamen still available for the navy not a small proportion preferred to sail in privateers because of the chances of great gains offered by them.

The last naval action of the Revolutionar var was fought by the Alliance, Capt. John Barry. He had sailed from Havana on March 7. 1782, with a large quantity of specie for the United States, and had the Duc de Laurun in mpany. When not long out of port three British frigates were encountered. The Lauzun, a slow sailer, was ordered to throw her guns overboard and run for it, but Capt. Barry waited for the leading English frigate and a fight ensued.

At the end of fifty minutes the Englishman, although his ship, the Sybille, was heavier than the Alliance, hung out signals of distress, and hauled off under cover of his consorts. The significant feature of this fight is the wide diffe ence between the two lists of killed and wounded, the Englishmen having twelve times as many killed and nearly five times as many disabled. Evidently the Yankees had learned to handle

cannon effectively. The record of the national navy. tinguished from privateers, during the Revolutionary war, is summed up by Mr. Spears on page 300 of his first volume. On July 4, 1778, when the Congress declared the independence of the colonies, the American Navy consisted of twentyfive vessels, for the most part small craft, mounting four hundred and twenty-two guns, all told. Thereafter other ships were built, some were purchased, some, again, were captured from the enemy, and put into service. For the reason, however, that the enemy had at all times more than five guns affoat and in service on the Amercan coast for every one gun the Americans ould muster on their naval list, the American ships, one by one, felt into the hands of the British or were lost at sea, or were destroyed to save them from capture. When the war ended but three naval ships remained, carrying eighty-four guns between them. The American Savy had almost perished. Without its aid however, the war of the Revolution must have failed. From the day when the hearts of th Continentals, encamped before Boston, were fired by the long wagon train loaded with war material captured by an American cruiser from the enemy, until the last service ren dered by the Alliance in bringing specie from Havana, there was never a time when the ea power of the nascent republic did not render avaluable assistance to the patriots ashore. In ne 800 ships taken from the enemy were found the materials that succored the life of the nation. It is further to be noted that not one American oruiser was captured by English privateers, whereas sixteen English cruisers were taken by American privateers, manned, in many eases, for the most part by boys and haymakers

It was characteristic of the dread of monarch-

cal institutions then entertained that no soone

was the war of the Revolution over than all the

nen who remained in the naval service were

paid off and turned adrift, while every vesse

oft was sold. It was some thirteen years before we again had the nucleus of a navy, and we night have waited longer for it had not the British Government incited the Barbary pirates to prey upon our commerce. About this inci-dent there is no doubt, and Mr. Spears has done well to dwell upon it, for we hear too little of i in school bistories. It is pointed out by the auhor of this narrative that Lord Sheffield said in Parliament in 1784: "It is not probable that the American States will have a very free trade in the Mediterranean. It will not be to the interests of any of the great maritime powers to protect them from the Barbary States If they know their interests, they will not enourage the Americans to be carriers. That the Barbary States are advantageous to maritime owers is certain." The British Government lid not confine itself to the avowal of this inferaal policy in the balls of Parliament, Mr. Spears reminds us that for some time previously to 1793 Portugal had maintained her rights upon he sea, as against the Moslem pirates, by keep strong fleet at the Straits of Gibralta which pounced upon every Barbary corsain hat came in sight. By an understanding with the United States the American flag was protect ed, and American merchantmen were furnishe with convoys when such were needed. Under the protection thus afforded American merchant men awarmed in the ports on the east side of the Atlantic. The increasing number of American hips there was viewed by English merchants with dismay and disgust, and English diplomacy conintervened. Taking advantage of a general agreement among the so-called Christian powrs, under which England was to be allowed to act for all in certain minor matters when nego tiating with the Barbary powers, the British Government instructed its agent at Algiers to bargain secretly for a truce between the Dey and the Government of Portugal. The truce was to last a year, and in consideration of the Dey's allowing the Portuguese ships to trade ree of backmail the Portuguese blockade was to be removed from the Straits of Gib. raltar, and it was further provided that the Portuguese Government should not afford protection to any nation against Algerian cruisers." The significance of this provision will be appreciated when the fact is noted that the only nation which had been protected by Portuguese men-o'-war was the American. Obviously, the truce was planned to turn the against American ships, and, made, British influence at the court of Lisbon prevented its abrogation. The moment British lomacy had freed the corsairs of Aigier from the Portuguese blockade they went forth against the Stars and Stripes. In one cruise they captured eleven vessels, and reduced one hundred and twelve American seamen to slavery. For the ransom of these prisoners, and for an ill-kept promise of peace, the United States Government, which had refused build a navy for the protection of Americans abroad, had to pay the Dey of Algiers nearly million of dollars, a sum sufficient to have kept the barbarian's port sealed had it been expended in building warships. Even after the publication of this fact, it was only by a majority of two that the House of Representatives passed, in 1794, a resolution to the effect that a naval force adequate to the safeguarding of the commerce of the United States ought to be provided. In pursuance of this resolution six frigates were ordered to be laid down, three-the Consti tution, the President, and the United States of forty-four guns each, and the other three-the Chesapeake, the Congress, and the Con stellation-of thirty-six guns each. These ships were constructed upon principles which had much to do with our naval successes in the war of 1812. It was decided that they should e made longer and broader than the existing type of frigate, and yet not so high out of water ramed on this model, they would be able to carry as many guns on one deck as British frigates carried on two decks, could fight them to better advantage, and, what was of even more importance, the hulls would possess so much more stability that much more canvas could be spread aloft, and, accordingly, the Yanke ressel would be able to show her teeth o her heels as occasion should demand The United States was launched in July 1797, and the Constitution in Octobe the same year. Later, in addition to the six frigates ordered, a dozen smaller hips were built or purchased, besides galleys, schooners, and brigs. We had need of them or the French cruisers were playing havoc with American ships carrying goods to European When, in 1798, open hostilities at sea began between the United States and France he American Novy had, in all, twenty-two ves sels, mounting 456 guns, carrying 3,484 mer eady for battle. We need not run over in detail the victories gained by our cruisers over he French, merely noting that the stellation captured the Insurgente and beat Vengeance, and that the Berceau. The twelve-gun captured chooner Enterprise captured eight Frenchnen and recaptured four American ships which the French had taken. By the peace ratified in 1801 all Government vessels captured on either side were to be restored, but this provision permitted the Americans to retain seventy-six French ships. privateers and armed merchantmen, which together carried 500 guns.

The war with Tripoli followed the maritime puarrel with France, and it was characteristic of the attitude of Englishmen toward the United States that a British subject named Lisle was Admiral of the Tripolitan fleet. The squadron sent against Tripoli consisted of President, the Philadelphia, the Essex, and the tweive-gun schooner Enterprise. But it soon appeared that, although well fitted for open sea

As Mr. Spears remarks, the patriotic American

does not recall with elation this collision with a

people who had rendered us indispensable as-

sistance when we were struggling for our

national existence.

enough to better down a well-fortified city. A blockade ensued, and on Oct. 31, 1808, the frigate Philadelphia, Capt. William Bainbridge, while chasing a corsair, grounded on a reef and had to be surrendered to the enemy. Eventnally the pirates hauled her off and towed her to an anchorage under the Bashaw's castle It was evident that, with 315 American prisoners, including twenty-two officers, and with a swift and substantial thirty-six-gun frigate added to his fleet, the Bashaw of Tripoli had gained a decided advantage over the Americans. He did not keep the frigate long. On Feb. 16, 1804, Stephen Decatur, a young man of 24, with body of seamen bidden in a ketch, entered the harbor of Tripoli, boarded the Philadelphia, killed or drove overboard the crew, burned the ship, and escaped unharmed, thus performing what Nelson described as the most daring act of the age. After the destruction o the Philadelphia, the war against the Tripolitans was pressed with so much vigor that the became alarmed, and eventually offered to deliver up all prisoners for a ransom of \$60, 000, and to agree never again to trouble American commerce. This offer was accepted, and peace followed. The fleet then sailed to Tunis whose ruler, incited by the British Consul-General, had expelled the American agent. To the Bey terms of peace were dictated under the muzzles of the guns of the flect. So closed the story of the American Navy's work during the period from the Revolution to the war of 1812. In the concluding chapter of the first volume Mr. Spears explains why we fought with England in 1812. After reciting the series of out rages perpetrated upon American citizens, he ends with a stirring account of the unprovoked assault of the British frigate Leopard on the American frigate Chesapeake, to compel four so-called deserters, of whom three were American seamen, to return to the slavery from which they had escaped. It is well known that the Brit ish Admirat Berkeley issued a circular ordering any British ship which should fall in with the Chesapeake to take the pretended deserters from her by force if necessary. Capt. Barron of the Chesapeake naturally refused to surrender them, whereupon the Leopard which had been made ready for action poured a broadside into the American ship The Chesapeake, being wholly unprepared fo an attack in time of peace, could make no re ply, and her Captain, after three men had been killed and eighteen wounded, felt constrained to haul down his flag. What, asks the author of this history, does the uninformed reader suppose that the political leaders of the American republic did about this abominable outrage They performed the puerile act of tearing the eagie from the American coat of arms and substituting the porcupine. In addition, they requested the British Government to disavow the act of Admiral Berkeley, and ordered the build ing of 188 more gunboats for harbor defence.

J. A. Roebuck. John Arthur Roebuck was a man of unique personality who played a conspicuous part in British affairs for nearly half a century, and It is, therefore, surprising that no biogra phy of him should have appeared during the eighteen years following his death. It was known that he had left some chapters of auto blography; these have now been expanded and continued up to the date of his decease in the Life and Letters of John Arthur Roebuck, edited by ROBERT EDON LEADER (Edward Arnold). It s well known that the subject of the book wa the most bitter and implacable enemy whom the cause of the Union had in England during the war of the rebellion, but he is not the less interesting to us on that account. On more grounds than this, his biogra phy will be read with interest. He was a mawho never had the advantage of education at a university or great public school; indeed, he used to say that the only instruction he ever re ceived he got from women. Like John Bright, he obtained his vocabulary from a careful study of English master works, and, like Bright, he soon ecame distinguished for his control of striking and incisive speech. Like John Stuart Mill, he was a utilitarian, a disciple of Jeremy Bentham. and, like Mill, he was, at the same time, often influenced by his feelings. Born in Madras. he spent the most plastic years of youth in Upper Canada, among the "United Empire Loyalists," the descendants of those Tories who had migrated from the United States after the Revolution. To this fact is probably due his hostility to the Union, which was largely a matter of sentiment. He began life a an independent Radical of the most ad vanced type, and long showed himself opposed the great political parties, nouncing the hope of office; yet, in his old age he fell into the ranks of the Conservatives, I came a supporter of Lord Beaconsfield, and died a Privy Councillor.

John Arthur Roebuck was born, as have said, at Madras in 1802. His father was a younger son of Dr. John Roebuck, the founder of the Carron Iron Works in Scot land, and well known in the scientific world His mother was a daughter of Richard Tickell, a member of the coterie of Fox and Sheridan and a descendant of Addison's friend, Thomas Tickell, the translator of the Iliad. The subject of this memoir tells us, in a fragment of his autobiography: "My father's brother, Benja min, was Paymaster-General of the East India Company's forces at Madras at the time of my parents' marriage, and my father took his young wife to India. She was then about 21, having been married at 16. She left three children in England, all boys, in the care of her mother; bore three children in India, all boys, and came home in 1807, leaving her hus-band in India. He then had the almost certain prospect of making a great fortune, but on the very day that his wife and children landed in England he Ged suddenly. My uncle Benjamin died shortly afterward. Thus my mother was left with six whildren and with very uncertain means. She had to clucate them and put them forward in the world without assistance from her late husband's family or her own." Under the circumstances, it was not surprising that the young widow should soon marry again. The hus band she chose was a Mr. Simpson, a merchant, but an unsuccessful one; after many scheme had been tried and falled, the family emigrated to Canada in the year 1815. Here John Arthur Roebuck lived until 1824. His brothers grew to be powerful men. He, on the contrary, was from the beginning, small, frail, and before he went to Canada, an invalid. His health there became assured, but he never became strong. An accident to his knee had made him lame for life, and always interfered with any great phys ical exertion. Perhaps his unfitness for outdoor sports may have been a blessing in dis-guise, for it enabled him to devote all his ietsare time to study. He read, he tells us, and pored over the English classics day and night. He also taught himself French, to gether with a good deal of Latin, to which Italian was added some years late: Having determined to return to England, and to try his fortune at the bar, he started for Lor don at the age of 22, with £50 in his pocket 'That I was allowed to do this," he writes seems to be now a wonder and something worse. That I was not shipwrecked and cas upon the world without hope is now to me marvel. I was, indeed, supported for som short time by uncertain remittances from Canada, but they soon failed utterly, and I was brown upon my own unaided resources." Luckily, among the friends of his mother, was the well-known scholar, Thomas Love Peacock, to whom he took a letter of introduction, and by whom he was introduced to J. S. Mill, who eventually made him a member of the Utilitarian Society, which met once a week at the house of Jeremy Bentham, for the purpose of discussion. Roebuck became some thing of a favorite with the older philosopher who, apparently, foresaw the mark his young friend would, one day, make in the world. There is a playfully affectionate reference to Roebuck in Browning's "Life of Bentham. I have been catching fish," Bentham said one day. "I have caught a carp. I shall hang him up and feed him with bread and milk. He shall be my tame puss, and shall play about on the floor. But I have a new tame puss. I shall

make Rosbuck my puss for his article on Cana-

da. And many a mouse shall he catch." Of J. 8. Mill's father we read; "James Mill had no great liking for his son's new friends, He looked down on us because we were poor and not greatly allied, for, while in words he was a severe Democrat, in fact and in conduct, he bowed down to wealth and position. To the young men of wealth and position who came to see him he was gracious and instructive, while to us he was rude and curt, gave us no advice, but seemed pleased to hurt and offend us. This led to remonstrance and complaint on the part of John Mill, but the result was that we soon ceased to see him at his home. Our chief point of reunion was the house of George Grote, Mrs. Grote being the means of bringing us together.'

II. The Reform bill became law in 1832, and Ros uck, now a man of 30, having been very active in the extra-parliamentary proceedings which had attended the passing of that measure. became known to many public men, and, among others, to Joseph Hume, who, at that time, was a man of great mark and power. Many of the new constituencies created by the Reform bill had great confidence in him; the City of Bath showed its confidence by asking him to select for them a man whom they might send as their Representative to Parliament. He sent them down three names, of which Roebuck's was one, and the choice of the Liberal majority fell upon him. As it turned out, Mr. Roebuck was to find at Bath not only a seat in Parlia ment, but also a wife, Miss Falconer, a sis ter of one of his principal supporters. The eat was not won without great exertion, for all the influences of purse and position were against him. Indeed, the contest in which he was successful is still remembered in Bath. His chief power lay in the enthusiasm which his candidacy evoked among the poor. It is necessary to recall the bitter hatred against Whig and Tory government which then rankled among the working classes in order to understand the enthusiasm with which they received the man of the people, or the furious violence of aristocrats and capitalists at his intrusion. In his various addresses and speeches he declared himself a Radical of the Radicals, a convinced and zealous upholder of the most advanced creeds. Among the innovations posed by him were not only some which have since passed into law, but many the acceptance of which seems still far distant. He advocated, for example, the abolition of slavery, the removal of all civil and religious disabilities, free trade, the repeal of the tax on knowledge, an equitable adjustment of taxation, a national system of secular education, and vote by bailot. He was equally in favor of triennial Parliacorporation reform, of an elective magistracy, of the abolition of the legal mocopoly enjoyed by the Inns of Court, and of the disestablishment of the Anglican Church and the devotion of its property to secular uses.

experiences, and, to glance at them, we depart from the chronological order. Mr. John Temple Leader recalls that, one evening in his house at Putney Hill, some one mentioned a scene in which the colossal Daniel O'Connell had used very strong language to a Tory M. P. in the labby of the House of Commons. Turning to Roebuck the narrator asked: "What would you have done in such a case !" "I would have knocked him down!" answered Roebuck, flerce ly, and clenching his fist. This made every bod laugh, considering the great physical difference between Roebuck, who, as we have said, was small, spare man, and O'Connell, who was stalwart Irish giant. In 1835 Roebuck be involved in a quarrel with one John Black, then editor of the Morning Chronicle. Having declined to retract certain offensive epithets employed by him, he (Roebuck) received a chal lenge, which he accepted. On the field Roebuck received Black's fire, but fired himself in the air. After the first fire Roebuck persisted in refusing to withdraw the terms "base and disgraceful," which he had applied to Black's conct. The affair accordingly went on, and shots were again exchanged without effect. An apology was again demanded and again refused, Roebuck declaring that he was not to be driven from the right of stigmatizing the conduct of a conspicnous man, as it deserved, by threats of assassination. Ultimately the seconds deemed it unnecessary to carry the matter further. Roebuck's second duel was fought four years later. His antagenist was Lord Powerscourt, who thought himself aggrieved by expressions used by Roebuck respecting his conduct at the election of 1837. The meeting took place at Coombe Wood, near London. On the field efforts were renewed to avert the necessity of proceeding to extremities. Lord Powerscourt's friending to extremities. Lord Powerscourt's friending to extremities. Lord Powerscourt's friending to do so, the ground was measured and the principals placed at twelve paces. On Roebuck's receiving his adversary's fire he discharged his pistolinto the air, and, advancing to Lord Powerscourt, said: "Now, my lord, I am ready to make any apology your lordship may suggest, for certainly in my speech at Bath I did not mean to imply anything personally offensive." We are told that Lord Powerscourt regretted the part that he had taken in this affair, and that years afterward, on his deathbed, he sent Lord Jocelyn to ask for Mr. Roebuck's pardon and forgiveness. We may here add that I was Roebuck whose courage had been tried and was unquestioned, who put a stop to the interference with the freedom of speech in Parliament by means of the absurd custom of requiring a man to stand up outside of the Parliament House and be shot at for what he had said in debate. In 1937 Mr. Roebuck lost his seat for Bath, but recained it in 1841. He was finally rejected by that constituency in 1847, having been beaten by Lord Ashley, afterward Lord Shaftesbury, who, cears afterward, expressed at Sheffield profound regret that he had ever opposed Mr. Roebuck at Bath. The latter's friends marked their appreciation of his services by presenting to him a testimonial consisting of £500, placed in an oak cabinet, covered with carved emblems and figures, each one of which was executed by a separate workman.

Mr. Roebuck was not long excluded from Parliament, having been elected for Sheffield in 1842, and died a member of the House of Commons. buck's second duel was fought four years later. His antagonist was Lord Powerscourt, who

111. Now, let us glance at Rosbuck's attitude toward the United States, which was to become of importance to us during the civil war, all the more that he had been, all his life, a Rad ical and the repres ntative of the British work ingman. No one would have predicted the harm which he strove to do us from a letter to an American correspondent, penned in September, 1859. We quote this letter because it contains the only kindly wor 's spoken of the United States in this apacious volume: "I sh uld have liked much to talk over with you the relations that do, and those that ought to, exist between the United States and England. There is much required to be done to make the reciprocal feelings on both sides of the Atlantic such as they ought to be. But do not suppose that there ex ists in England any prejudice against the United States. There may be some fools and

ligence, are daily rubbing down asperities, and that we shall be, what we ought to be as the only free peoples on the earth, united heart and and against despotism and bad government wherever found."

The author of this second

wherever found."

The author of this snave epistle sang another song when the Rebellion had begun. In August. 1862, he took advantage of a visit naid by Lord Palmerston, then Premier, to Sheffled, to urge on his lordship the immediate recognition of Southern independence. He stigmatized the attempt to reunite the Status of America as an "immeral proceeding, totally incapable of success." They could never be reunited, he declared, The conduct of the people of the North to England he described as "insolent and overbearing." A divided America, he protested, would be a benefit to England. To the following words an additional sting was imported by the fact that they were uttered in the Prime Minister's pres-A divided America, he protested, would be a benefit to England. To the following words an additional sting was imported by the fact that they were uttered in the Prime Minister's presence, and, indeed, were almost addressed to him personally: "The North will never be our friends. Of the South you can make friends. They are Englishmen. They are not the seum and refuse of Europe." It was reported that Lord Palmerston said of one of Roobnek's speeches on the recognition of the Confederate States, that It was "a devilish good speech, and just his opinion, but that he could not officially say so. Mr. Roebuck missed, in truth, no opportunity of arraying all his influence on the side of the South. He advocated its cause at meetings of his constituents, and in Parliament he moved an address to the Crown, praying her Majesty to enter into negotiations with the great powers of herove to obtain their concernation in recognizing the independence of the Confederates. The motion had been preceded by a remarkable transaction, and was largely beautifully with the second of the South was described by a remarkable transaction, and was largely beautifully and the second of the South when the second of the south had been preceded by a remarkable transaction, and was largely beautifully and the second of the south them. the great powers of hurope to obtain their cooperation in recognizing the independence of the
Confederates. The motion had been preceded
by a remarkable transaction, and was largely
based on it. Mr. Linds y, member for Sunderland, who had the entrée of the Tuileries by
reason of having been consulted on navigation
matters, had proceeded to Paris, accompanied
by Mr. Rochuck, for the purpose of stimulating
Napoleon III. to take active steps toward acknowledging the South. To the two Englishmen an audience was accorded, and the usual
result of amateur diplomacy followed. No two of
the parties agreed as towhat actually had taken
place. The Emperor disavowed, or declined to
be bound by, the version of the conversation
which Mr. Rocbuck gave to the House of Commons. The amazement and amusement with
which this mission to a ruler whore, a few years
before, Rocbuck had denounced as a "perjured
despot" was received by the general public was expressed in pungent sarcam
by John Bright. Lord Palmerston was
constrained to point out the embarrass
ment resulting from the communication to
the House of Commons of words that had passed
between private members and the sovereign of
a foreign country; and, in deference to the Promier's strong remonstrance, Mr. Rochuck reluctantly abandoned his motion. The time came,
in August, 1864, when Rocbuck, speaking at
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the United States. In
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the United States. In
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the United States. In
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the United States. In
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the United States. In
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the United States. In
the same year, nevertheless, writing to a friend,
have had him act toward the tweet of rightene but the experience of America frightens me. I am not ashamed to use the word Prightened. During my whole life I have looked to that country as about to solve the great problem of self-government [he had done his best to provent her solving it], and now, in my old age, the hopes of my youth and manhood are destroyed, and I am left to reconstruct my political philosophy, and doubt and hesitation beset me on every point." At the Cutler's Feast, in September, 1868, Rochuck gave fresh offence to British workingmen, by unpleasant references to the United States, made in the presence of Mr Reverdy Johnson, then American Minister in England. There had, he said, been poured into America a tide of corruption, "a feedlent torrent." of almost all the vice and turbulence of Europe. "We see," he continued, "the wild Irishman, the flery Frenchman, the assassinating Jtalian and the dumfounded Spaniard, all going out in one mass, and wishing to fulfil their expectations in the mind of America." We observe, finally, that, at a banquet giv n to bim in Sheffleld in March, 1869, when he was presented by his friends and admirers with £3,000, invested in Consols, he delivered what he called his "political testament," It was comprehensed in these three points: "Heware of trades unions; beware of Ireland; beware of America." It was not only his opposition to the cause of the Union that had caused him to lose the seat for Sheffleld in the preceding year at the hands of workingmen. They resented, also, his avowal of pro-Austrian sympathics his opposition to the ltalian struggle for independence, and his disposition to throw water on the struggles of the Poles for freedom. As to Ireland, he denied the existence of any troubles that were not self-made and self-curable; and, in connection with disturbances in New Zealand, he relterated with unmitigated harshness his often-proclaimed views on the inevitable law that the price of civilized colonization is the extermination of aborigines. The soner, he said, the Maoris were destroyed, the bett Roebuck was short, slight, lame and feeble, but he possessed limitless pluck, and, in his very first canvass at Bath, he had one of the many physical encounters which marked his public career. One Mr. Foster, who had offered himself as a Conservative candidate, meeting Rocbuck in the coffee room of a hotel, was offensive and insulting. Roebuck demanded his card, and, upon Foster's demurring, threatened, if it were not produced, to knock him down. Roebuck tendered his own card, and when Foster contemptuously tore it up, the little man struck him in the face. There was no duel this time, however, but in subsequent years the conflicts in which Roebuck's directness of attack and pungency of speech involved him were not by any means confined to words. At the beginning of his career, duelling, though dying out, was not yet dead, and Roebuck pos sessed, in a large measure, the readiness to appeal to muscular force which is not infre quently characteristic of men physically weak A chapter of this book is devoted to his duelling

It is a strictly conservative, and, on the whole, satisfactory, review of the proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research which Mr. FRANK PODMORE has given us in the book en titled Studies in Psychical Research (Putnams). The society in question was founded in 1882, under the Presidency of Prof. H. Sidgwick. subsequent presiding officers having been Prof. Balfour Stewart, the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, Prof. William James of Harvard, and Mr. Wil liam Crookes. For fifteen years it has subjected certain remarkable phenomena, including those of spiritualism, hypnotism, and clairvoyance. to systematic and scientific observation Different conclusions have been arrived at by different members of the society, and Mr. Podmore simply states his own. To some of his colleagues the evidence seems to indicate that ught can influence thought, untr the machinery of sense organs and ethereal un dulations; that the human soul can, while still attached to the body, transcend the limits of space and time and the laws of the physical orld, and can, after the death of the body prevail to make its presence known to us here. To Mr. Podmore's thinking, the evidence is too slender and too ambiguous to bear the weight of such tremendous issues, and, though he holds that in the single case of telepathy we may as a working hypothesis postulate supernormal agencies, he considers that the proof of their transcendental nature is still wanting. We shall glance at his conclusions in detail directing particular attention to the grounds or which he takes a somewhat more favorable view of the evidence for thought-transference, or telepathy, for the reason that Mr. E. W. Scripture, author of "The New Psychology," maintains that the so-called mystery of thought transference may be accounted for in a very simple way.

witnessed at spiritualists' séances, Mr. Podmore arrives at the conviction that they are all explainable by fraud. "In the face," he says, of exposures of fraud, repeated ad nausear in the face of the observed propensity in this field to even disinterested fraud; in the face of the demonstrated incompetence, even of trained observers, to cope with fraud; we should not be justified in assuming any other cause for the spiritual phenomena of spiritualism than fraud, eked out, possibly, on rare occasions by fraudulently suggested hallufinations. Unless, and until, some feat is performed which fraud cannot explain, the presumption that fraud is the all-sufficient cause remains unshaken." Quoted, also, with approval, are the words of Mr. Crookes, now President of the Society for Psychical Research "The Spiritualist tells of flowers with the fresh dow on them, of fruit and living objects. being carried through closed windows, and even solid brick walls. The scientific lavestigator naturally asks that an additional weight (if it be only the 1-1000 part of a grain) be deposited on one pan of his balance when the case is locked; and the chemist asks that 1-1000th part of a grain of arsenic be carried through the sides of a glass tube in which pure water is hermetically scaled," When this demand is complied with, or when any other result is produced which does not depend for proof of its genuineness on the exercise of connuous observation by fallible human senses, it will be time to revise Mr. Podmore's provisional onclusion and to search for some other expla-

E.

After a careful examination of the phenomen

nation. Touching the outbreaks of bell ringing and other physical disturbances, more or less familar in all countries, and attributed by the Ger mans to "poltergoists," our author's verifict, after an extended analysts of the evidence, is United States. There may be some fools and bigoted people who still retain the foclings that many of our forefathers felt. But all the enlightened men, and the educated classes granter. In the chapter on hightened men, and the educated classes granter. In the chapter on the observation and errors of memory. In the chapter on the observation whom we always call our brethren on the other side of the water. These kind feelings toward those whom we always call our brethren on the other side of the water. These kind feelings I believe to be returned by the genuine Americans. You have, however, a very active class whom the injurice of England has sent among you—I mean the Irish and their descendants—who hate the very name of England. These men are in possession very generally of the press in America; they are active and they are noisy, and they give a fone to your periodical press that misleads English people. I hope, however, the growing intercourse between the two peoples, and their growing intercourse here.

ore finds that the evidence does not justify rinds that the evidence described has the evidence of post-mortem agency, though inclined to think that is some cases cosents characteristics which seem to to telepathic origin. Another chapter voted to presentiments, premonitions and sions. There is a large amount of recents along relating to these phenomena, and there may be mentioned the calebrated prois devoted to presentiments, promonitions and previsions. There is a large amount of recess teatimony relating to these phenomens, and there are some memorable traditional cases. Among the latter may be mentioned the celebrated predictions made by La Harpe shortly before the French revolution concerning the fate that would overtake many distinguished personages. There, analin, is Mr. Williams's dream of the assastination of Mr. Percival in the lobby of the House of Commons in 1812. Among more recent cases, we have a second or third hand account of a dream, the dreamer being a prominent member of the Society of Friends at Bristol, foreshudowing the Bristol riots of 1811. We have a Brist band, uncorroborated account of a vision of the French revolution of 1845; and there is a case fresting on two independent memories in which a soldier in the American civil war is said to have foretold Ms own death in some of the movements of the movements of the movement of the movement of the movement of the movement of the soldier in the Society for Psychical Research in which a gentleman relates how he dreamed the Ms and the second of the soldier in the Society for Psychical Research in which a gentleman relates how he dreamed one morning, and told his wife before breakfast the whole series of the coming of the Society for Psychical Research in which a gentleman relates how he dreamed the second of the soldier in the second of the coming of the soldier in the second of the second of the coming of the soldier for the second of the coming of the soldier of the second of the coming of the soldier of the second of the coming of the soldier of the second of the coming of the second o thor regards it as premature to deliver a ver-dict. He has no doubt, however, that the trances of Mrs. Piper furnish the most impor-tant testimony which the Society for Psychical Research has yet adduced to the existence of omething beyond telepathy.

deas and impressions from one mind to another by other than normal means. Mr. E. W. scripture, in his book, "The New Psychology," insists that the transference of thought by conact has been proved to be brought about through the communication of involuntary, unconscious movements of the muscles of the hand, or arm; and, secondly, that the transference of thought without contact has been proved to be brought about through the production of the involuntary, unconscious movements employed in pasal whispering. It was Cumberland who showed that, in the case of contact, mind reading was simply muscle reading. To explain what is meant by nasal whispering, we must recall the remarkable experiment made by Hansen and Lebmann. We quote Mr. Scripture's account of this experiment: "If a thought in one person's mind is transmitted into that of another person, the transference of energy must have occurred in some way. Let us suppose it to resemble the transmission of sound in the air. or of light and electricity in the other, in being a vibratory movement of known or unknown medium. Now, all hitherto investigated vibratory movements are reflected from metal mirrors, and this new one will probably be no exception to the rule, By means of concave mirrors, therefore, we may expect to concentrate the thoughts strongly to a focus, so that the experiments, which now succeed only occasionally, may succeed in large numbers, whereby we can hope to study their laws. Lehmann, a psychologist, and Hansen, a physician, prepared two concave metal mirrors the size of which was such that the focus lay in the plane of the opening, the diameter of this opening being ninety centimeters. The mirrors, were placed opposite each other, with their axes falling in the same straight line, and their foci distant by two meters. Each of the two persons to be experimented upon, the percipient and the agent, sat with his head in a focus, the face being turned to the mirror." The two sat, of course, back to back, but without touching one another. So much but without touching one another. So much for the apparatus; now let us see how it was employed to detect involuntary whispering. Messra. Hansen and Lehmann had previously noticed in the subjects of experiment a marked tendency toward action of the muscles of speech whenever a number was thought of for a while. This teneency was suppressed by a special effort. When no such effort was made, the one subject, with his ear at the focus of the mirror, could hear the involuntary sounds produced by the other subject in spite of the fact that the mouth was

Now let us see what the author has to say

regarding telepathy, or the transference of

marked of any children with the control of the cont